UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,347	09/14/2005	Norbert Lesch	DE030084US1	6708

24737 7590 04/02/2008
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
VU, JIMMY T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2821	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/549,347	LESCH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JIMMY T. VU	2821	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 February 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 4-16* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/01/2008 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1 and 4-16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 10, the phrase "the gas discharge lamp screening" is not understood. Does applicant mean of the "gas discharge lamp screening" as the "electrically conductive screening"? Please, clarify.

In claims 13 and 14, line 10; claims 4 and 8, line 3; claim 5, lines 2 and 3; claims 6, 10 and 11, line 2; claim 7, line 11; claim 12, lines 3 and 4; claims 15 and 16, lines 9 and 11, the limitation "the screening of the gas discharge lamp" is also not understood as mentioned above. Please, clarify.

In claim 9, line 2 and claim 14, line 11, the limitation "the additional return line" is lack of antecedent basic. Please change to "the supply line" for proper reading.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Keep with next

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0 pt + Tab after: 36 pt + Indent at: 0 pt

Deleted: ¶
¶

Deleted: ¶
Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112¶
<#>The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:¶
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. ¶
¶
<#>Claims 1 and 4-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.¶
Regarding claims 1, line 10, the limitation "the gas discharge lamp screening" is not clear. What is the screening that applied to be the gas discharge lamp screening? There are several screenings was claimed in the instant application. Clarification of this limitation is required.(It looks like he is talking about the "electrically conductive screening." It appears that an objection here would be more appropriate.)¶
Regarding claims 13 and 14, line 10, claims 4 and 8, line 3; claim 5, lines 2 and 3; claims 6, 10 and 11, line 2; claim 7, line 11; claim 12, lines 3 and 4; claims 15 and 16, lines 9 and 11, the limitation "the screening of the gas discharge lamp" is also not clear as mentioned above. Clarification of this limitation is required.¶
Regarding claim 9, line 2 and claim 14, line 11, the limitation "the additional return line" is not clear. What is the line that applied to be the additional return line? Clarification of this limitation is required.¶
¶

Deleted: 4

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Deleted: 5

4. Claims 7, 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent 6,459,203) in view of Willemsen (U.S. Patent 3,649,864).

Regarding claim 7, Kim discloses a gas discharge lamp as shown in Figs 4-7 with a discharge vessel (2, Fig. 4-7), electrodes (2a, 2b, Figs. 4-7, column 2, lines 62-63) projecting into the discharge vessel (2), a screening (6, Fig. 4, column 2, line 60) which screens the discharge vessel (2) and comprises connection means (4, 5, column 2, lines 64-65, 8, column 3, line 42) for providing an at least high-frequency connection between the screening (6) and a screening (1) of an electrical system used for operating the gas discharge lamp (2) so as to form a coaxial (wire) screening system enclosing the discharge vessel (in side the screening (6)) with the electrodes (2a, 2b) during operation of the gas discharge lamp (2); wherein the screening of the gas discharge lamp (6) is electrically connected to one of the electrodes (2a, 2b) (Fig. 4).

Kim does not specific disclose the screening being screened by a translucent electrical conductor material, and the screening of the gas discharge lamp serves as a power supply line.

Willemsen shows a discharge lamp having an envelop (6, Fig. 1, col. 3, line 13) screened by a conductive transparent layer (9, Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 13-14), which being a current supply conductor of the lamp (col. 1, lines 11-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a conductive transparent layer used for screening and served as a power supply line as taught by Willemsen employed in the

apparatus of Kim in order to provide a shielding characteristic and stabilize the light radiation of the lamp.

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Kim and Willemsen discloses the electrode (2a, 2b; Fig. 4 of Kim) connected to a supply line (3a, 3b, 3c; Fig. 4 of Kim), which is arranged in parallel to the screening (6, Fig. 4 of Kim).

Regarding claim 12, Kim as disclosed in column 1, lines 18-22 that the lamp apparatus being capable of used in a luminaire; and other limitations have been taught by Kim as explained above (in claim 7).

5. Claims 9-11 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent 6,459,203) in view of Willemsen (U.S. Patent 3,649,864) and further in view of Goldberg (U.S. Patent 3,758,819).

Deleted: ¶
Deleted: 6

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Kim and Willemsen discloses all of the limitations except an inductive element included in the additional return line. However, as evidenced by Goldberg, providing an inductance (Fig. 1) is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the lamp system of Kim and Willemsen with the impedance in the additional return line as taught by Goldberg in order to maintain the current flowing into the lamp.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, the combination of Kim and Willemsen discloses the screening (6, Fig. 4 of Kim) connected with electrical conduction to a screening (1, Fig. 4 of Kim) of a lamp holder (8, Fig. 4 of Kim) during operation of the gas discharge lamp.

The combination of Kim and Willemsen does not teach the connection between the screenings with a capacitive component, and the connection of the screening of the gas discharge lamp to the electrode with a capacitive component.

However, as evidenced by Goldberg, providing a capacitor (C, Fig. 1) is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the lamp system of Kim and Willemsen with the capacitor (in combination with the connections of the screenings or from the lamp screening to the electrode) as taught by Goldberg in order to achieve stabilization of light radiation of the lamp.

Regarding claim 14, Kim discloses a gas discharge lamp as shown in Figs 4-7 with a discharge vessel (2, Fig. 4-7), electrodes (2a, 2b, Figs. 4-7, column 2, lines 62-63) projecting into the discharge vessel (2), a screening (6, Fig. 4, column 2, line 60) which screens the discharge vessel (2) and comprises connection means (4, 5, column 2, lines 64-65, 8, column 3, line 42) for providing an at least high-frequency connection between the screening (6) and a screening (1) of an electrical system used for operating the gas discharge lamp (2) so as to form a coaxial (wire) screening system enclosing the discharge vessel (in side the screening (6)) with the electrodes (2a, 2b) during operation of the gas discharge lamp (2); wherein the screening of the gas discharge lamp (6) is electrically connected to one of the electrodes (2a, 2b) (Fig. 4); the electrode (2a, 2b; Fig. 4) connected to a supply line (3a, 3b, 3c; Fig. 4), which is arranged in parallel to the screening (6, Fig. 4).

Kim does not specific disclose the screening being screened by a translucent electrical conductor material.

Willemsen shows a discharge lamp having an envelop (6, Fig. 1, col. 3, line 13) screened by a conductive transparent layer (9, Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 13-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a conductive transparent layer used for screening and served as a power supply line as taught by Willemsen employed in the apparatus of Kim in order to provide a shielding characteristic and stabilize the light radiation of the lamp.

The combination of Kim and Willemsen does not teach an inductive element included in the additional return line.

However, as evidenced by Goldberg, providing an inductance (Fig. 1) is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the lamp system of Kim and Willemsen with the impedance in the additional return line as taught by Goldberg in order to maintain the current flowing into the lamp.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Kim discloses a gas discharge lamp as shown in Figs 4-7 with a discharge vessel (2, Fig. 4-7), electrodes (2a, 2b, Figs. 4-7, column 2, lines 62-63) projecting into the discharge vessel (2), a screening (6, Fig. 4, column 2, line 60) which screens the discharge vessel (2) and comprises connection means (4, 5, column 2, lines 64-65, 8, column 3, line 42) for providing an at least high-frequency connection between the screening (6) and a screening (1) of an electrical system used

for operating the gas discharge lamp (2) so as to form a coaxial (wire) screening system enclosing the discharge vessel (in side the screening (6)) with the electrodes (2a, 2b) during operation of the gas discharge lamp (2); wherein the screening of the gas discharge lamp (6) is electrically connected to one of the electrodes (2a, 2b) (Fig. 4).

Kim does not specific disclose the screening being screened by a translucent electrical conductor material, and the screening of the gas discharge lamp serves as a power supply line.

Willemsen shows a discharge lamp having an envelop (6, Fig. 1, col. 3, line 13) screened by a conductive transparent layer (9, Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 13-14), which being a current supply conductor of the lamp (col. 1, lines 11-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a conductive transparent layer used for screening and served as a power supply line as taught by Willemsen employed in the apparatus of Kim in order to provide a shielding characteristic and stabilize the light radiation of the lamp.

The combination of Kim and Willemsen does not teach the connection between the screenings with a capacitive component, and the connection of the screening of the gas discharge lamp to the electrode with a capacitive component.

However, as evidenced by Goldberg, providing a capacitor (C, Fig. 1) is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the lamp system of Kim and

Willemsen with the capacitor (in combination with the connections of the screenings or from the lamp screening to the electrode) as taught by Goldberg in order to achieve stabilization of light radiation of the lamp.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objection set forth in this Office action.

7. Claims 2-6 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

None of the prior arts teaches or fairly suggests a gas discharge lamp comprising "a conductor track having a lower resistance than portions of the gas discharge lamp screening that is employed to enhance the conductivity of the gas discharge lamp" (claim 7), and "wherein at least one of the electrodes is electrically connected to a supply line comprising a screening within a coaxial cable" (claim 13).

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy T Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1832. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F: 9 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas W. Owens can be reached on (571) 272-1662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300.

Deleted: ¶
Deleted: 7
Deleted: rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph,
Deleted: 8
Deleted:
Deleted: rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph,
Deleted: ¶
Deleted: 9

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2800.

Jimmy Vu

March 26, 2008

/Douglas W Owens/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2821
March 31, 2008

Formatted: Line spacing: single